

REMARKS

A. Status of the Application

Claims 1-27 were pending in the instant application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,069,877 (“Yang”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0052083 (“Willins”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,555,192 (“Grube”).

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Willins in view of Grube, and in further view of Public Key Cryptography for Initial Authentication in Kerberos, Internet Draft, Tung, et al. (“Tung”).

The Examiner did not explicitly reject claim 4, but as a rejection for claim 5 was set forth by the Examiner, claim 5 being dependant upon claim 4, a rejection of claim 4 was inferred by the Applicant given the Examiners discussion of the Yang, Willins and Grube references with respect to pending claim 1.

With this response the Applicants have requested the amendment of claims 1-4, 8, 9, 18 and 22, and the cancellation of claims 7, 13-17, 19 and 23.

B. Rejections of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Willins and in view of Grube.

Addressing the rejection of claim 1 (and the presumed rejection of independent claim 4), and particularly the combination of Yang and Willins, the Examiner states that the two references can rightfully be considered “analogous art”. The Applicant takes issue with this and sees this combination as completely void of the requisite teaching, suggestion or motivation to make such a combination. Willins is a system for generating physical bar-coded tickets (paragraph [0003]) that employs an electronic signal representative of the physical ticket (paragraph [0017]). Yang is system to detect duplicate devices in a mobile communication network, and does not disclose the use of a KDC or the transmission of a ticket from a KDC (points the Examiner noted on page 3 of the instant final office action).

The Applicant provided a detailed explanation of what a ticket is within the context of the present invention in paragraph [0029] of the original application:

[0029] As used herein, a ticket is *an authentication token* provided to a client by the KDC. Among other information, *a ticket contains the name of the client, name of a specific server and a session key (a symmetric encryption key)*. The client name and session key need to be kept secret and are encrypted with another key, called a service key. The service key is a secret key that is known only to the KDC and the server named in the ticket. Because the client does not also possess this service key, it does not have the ability to decrypt the ticket and change its contents. Normally, the client also needs to know the session key and since it cannot get it out of the ticket, the KDC sends to this client a separate copy of the same session key.

Consequently, even if the Examiner maintains the that the combination of the Willins and Yang references was proper (something the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider), the combination of the two references most certainly fails to yield a system for detecting clones or duplicates within a communication system employing a KDC which transmits tickets (authentication tokens).

To remove any confusion as to the intended meaning of the term “ticket” in the Applicant’s claims, with this response the Applicant has requested the amendment of the claims so that all independent occurrences of “ticket” are replaced with “authentication token including

an encrypted session key”. The requisite support for these amendments can be found in paragraph [0029].

Given that the combination of Yang and Willins fails to yield a system for marking or denying service to clones or duplicates within a communication system employing a KDC which transmits authentication tokens including an encrypted session key, further combination with Grube also fails to provide any additional support for such. Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1, and pending claims 1-6, 8-12, 24 and 25 (which depend directly or indirectly there from) is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also rejected pending independent claims 18 and 22 on the basis of the Willins/Yang/Grubb combination. The Applicant has requested the amendment of each of these claims so that each occurrence of “ticket” is replaced with “authentication token including an encrypted session key”. This being the case, the Applicant submits that the argument put forth above with respect to claims 1-6, 8-12, 24 and 25 applies to 18, 20-22, and 24-26. Reconsideration is requested. all independent occurrences of “ticket” are replaced with “authentication token including an encrypted session key”.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance over the art cited by the Examiner. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the examiner is invited contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Dated: August 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Robert P. Marley
Registration No.: 32,914

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1907